

### REMARKS

In the September 29, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of the original claims (claims 1-55). This Response cancels claim 1, without prejudice or disclaimer, and amends claims 2, 6-9, 13-15, and 18. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 2-55 (4 independent claims; 54 total claims) remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillingham, U.S. Pat. No. 6,327,608 (hereinafter "Dillingham") in view of Wolf et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,818,447 (hereinafter "Wolf"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the spirit of expedited prosecution, claim 1 has been canceled and claim 8 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of original claim 1. Original claim 8 was dependent upon original claim 1. Accordingly, the scope of original claim 8 has not been narrowed or otherwise altered. Claims 2-7 and 9-19 variously depend from amended claim 8 and, therefore, the following remarks regarding amended claim 8 also apply to dependent claims 2-7 and 9-19.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine the references as proposed by the Examiner. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicants submit that the Examiner has not satisfied all of the basic criteria set forth above.

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner contends that Dillingham discloses receiving a command from the client device, where the command is indicative of an offline action performed by the client device (as recited in claim 8). The Examiner also contends that Dillingham discloses the UI server processing the command for execution by the server-based application (as recited in claim 8). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Dillingham and submit that the proposed combination of Dillingham and Wolf does not include each and every element of claim 8.

The Examiner cites to Dillingham, at Column 2, Lines 27-64, to support the rejection of claim 8. This passage, however, neither teaches nor suggests the receipt of a command indicative of an offline action as recited in claim 8. Dillingham discloses a file administration application that provides remote network access to a server-based file system via a client computer. The Dillingham system employs a client PC connected to the file server via the Internet. In this regard, one of the requirements of the Dillingham system is the PC-to-server connection. Indeed, Dillingham states that "[p]rior to gaining access to the server file system, the client first establishes a secure connection with the server" [Column 6, Lines 31-32].

Dillingham also states that “[t]he remote file administration architecture operates within the context of this secured environment. Accordingly, the commands described below for passing path names to the server and returning client scripts and data objects to the client are all securely exchanged over the Internet” [Column 6, Lines 48-52]. Dillingham simply does not teach or suggest the receipt and processing of an offline command as recited in claim 8.

For at least the above reasons, claim 8 is not unpatentable over Dillingham in view of Wolf, and Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 8 and claims 2-7 and 9-19, which variously depend from claim 8.

Claim 20 is an independent claim and claims 21-36 variously depend from claim 20. Claim 37 is an independent claim and claims 38-43 variously depend from claim 37. Claim 44 is an independent claim and claims 45-55 variously depend from claim 44. The Examiner rejected claims 20, 37, and 44 for the same reasons. Namely, the Examiner contends that Wolf discloses data representing a number of device capabilities (the Examiner cites Wolf at Column 2, Lines 43-65 to support this position). This passage of Wolf merely describes some specific processing tasks performed by the email system. This passage neither teaches nor suggests the generation, handling, or processing of data representing device capabilities of the client device. Furthermore, the Examiner contends that Dillingham discloses the step of generating a UI form definition based upon a number of device capabilities for the client device (the Examiner cites Dillingham at Column 3, Line 45 to Column 4, Line 24 to support this rejection). This passage of Dillingham merely describes the general system architecture shown in Dillingham’s FIG. 1. This passage neither teaches nor suggests the generation of a UI form based upon device capabilities for the client device.

For at least the above reasons, claims 20, 37, and 44 are not unpatentable over Dillingham in view of Wolf, and Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejections of claim 20, claims 21-36 (which variously depend from claim 20), claim 37, claims 38-43 (which variously depend from claim 37), claim 44, and claims 45-55 (which variously depend from claim 44).

Regarding claims 2, 38, and 52, the Examiner contends that Dillingham discloses the step of generating a UI form definition based upon a number of device capabilities for the client device (the Examiner cites Dillingham at Column 3, Line 45 to Column 4, Line 24 to support this rejection). This passage of Dillingham merely describes the general system architecture shown in Dillingham’s FIG. 1. This passage neither teaches nor suggests the generation of a UI form based upon device capabilities for the client device. For this additional reason, Applicants

request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 2, 38, and 52, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 3 and 53, the Examiner contends that Dillingham discloses the step of receiving data representing device characteristics and that Wolf discloses data representing device capabilities (the Examiner cites Wolf at Column 2, Lines 43-65 to support this position). As mentioned above, this passage of Wolf neither teaches nor suggests the generation, handling, or processing of data representing device capabilities of the client device. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 3 and 53, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 4, 26, and 41, the Examiner contends that Wolf discloses the use of at least one native UI control, as recited by Applicants (the Examiner cites Wolf at Column 9, Lines 40-54 to support this position). Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation of Wolf. Namely, this passage of Wolf merely defines the term "native frame" in the context of the Wolf system, and Wolf neither teaches nor suggests the use of a native UI control as recited in Applicants claims. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 4, 26, and 41, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 5 and 27, the Examiner states that Dillingham demonstrates an operating system for the client device and that Wolf shows one native UI control. Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Wolf. As mentioned in the immediately preceding paragraph, Wolf neither teaches nor suggests the use of a native UI control as recited in Applicants claims. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 5 and 27, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 9 and 30, the Examiner contends that Dillingham provides the step of maintaining a shadow cache at the UI server (citing Dillingham at Column 7, Lines 32-64). Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Dillingham. In particular, this passage of Dillingham only refers to a cache located at the client device. Dillingham contains no teaching or suggestion of a shadow cache maintained at the server side. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 9 and 30, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 10, 18, and 48, the Examiner again contends that Dillingham discloses a UI server with a shadow cache. As discussed in the immediately preceding paragraph, Applicants submit that this interpretation of Dillingham is incorrect. The Examiner also contends that Wolf discloses "information representing new, deleted, or modified source data items" (citing Wolf at Column 12, Lines 32-68). Applicants respectfully disagree with this

characterization of Wolf. This passage of Wolf describes the handling of email notes and the interaction between the email client application and a MAPI architecture. This passage neither teaches nor suggests the handling of new, deleted, or modified source data items recited in Applicants claims. For these additional reasons, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 10, 18, and 48, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 11 and 32, the Examiner again contends that Dillingham discloses a UI server with a shadow cache. As discussed above, Applicants submit that this interpretation of Dillingham is incorrect. The Examiner also states that Wolf teaches "a list of source data items" (citing Wolf at Column 9, Lines 7-55). The cited art, however, does not teach or suggest that the shadow cache at the UI server includes a list of source data items transmitted from the UI server to the client device, as recited in Applicants' claims. For these additional reasons, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 11 and 32, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 12, 33, and 55, the Examiner again contends that Dillingham discloses a UI server with a shadow cache. As discussed above, Applicants submit that this interpretation of Dillingham is incorrect. The Examiner also states that Wolf teaches "a list of source data items" (citing Wolf at Column 9, Lines 7-55). The cited art, however, does not teach or suggest that the shadow cache at the UI server includes a list of source data items saved locally by the client device, as recited in Applicants' claims. For these additional reasons, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 12, 33, and 55, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claim 14, the Examiner contends that Dillingham discloses a retrieving step performed by the UI server in response to a device identifier received from the client device (citing Column 4, Line 44 to Column 5, Line 12). Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation of Dillingham. Notably, this passage of Dillingham merely describes features associated with a conventional computer system. This passage does not teach or suggest a UI server that receives a device identifier from a client device, as recited in Applicants' claim 14. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 14 and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 15, 34, and 49, the Examiner alleges that Wolf discloses the transmitting of a first portion of a total number of source data items to the client device (citing Column 5, Line 22 to Column 6, Line 5). Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Wolf – this passage of Wolf contains no teaching or suggestion of the transmission of a first portion of a total number of source data items. For this additional reason,

Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 15, 34, and 49, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claims 16, 35, and 50, the Examiner contends that Dillingham discloses a UI server that transmits a subsequent portion of a total number of source data items to the client device in response to a request for additional source data items (citing Column 3, Line 45 to Column 4, Line 58). Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation of Dillingham – this passage neither teaches nor suggests the recited limitations. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 16, 35, and 50, and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claim 19, the Examiner contends that Dillingham teaches the UI server sending a push notification corresponding to push data to the client device (citing Column 6, Lines 30-55). Applicants disagree with this characterization of Dillingham – the cited passage contains no teaching or suggestion of pushing data from a UI server to the client device. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 19 and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claim 39, the Examiner references the rejection of claims 2 and 3. Accordingly, for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claims 2 and 3, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 39 and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claim 43, the Examiner contends that Wolf teaches that “the number of source data items represent a portion of a larger amount of related data available” (citing to Column 2, Lines 8-47). Applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of Wolf – the cited passage contains no teaching or suggestion of the recited limitations. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 43 and any claims dependent thereon.

Regarding claim 47, the Examiner again contends that Dillingham discloses a shadow cache as recited by Applicants. This contention is incorrect, as explained above in connection with claims 9 and 30. For this additional reason, Applicants request the withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 47 and any claims dependent thereon.

Should the Examiner elect to maintain any of the claim rejections addressed in this Response, Applicants would very much appreciate a detailed explanation of how the cited references teach the specific limitations recited in the rejected claims. As discussed above, Applicants submit that many of the Examiner’s rejections rely on inaccurate characterizations and interpretations of Dillingham and/or Wolf. The undersigned attorney of record would

welcome a telephone call from the Examiner if a more detailed discussion would expedite prosecution of the application.

Payment for the one month extension of time is being submitted herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be associated with this communication, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50/2258.

Respectfully submitted,



MARK M. TAKAHASHI  
Reg. No. 38,631

Date: JAN, 29, 2004

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH  
4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100  
San Diego, CA 92121-2133

Telephone: (858) 638-6748 Fax: (858) 638-6727